

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended claim 2 to correct a typographical error. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment of claim 2 to place claim 2 in better condition for appeal.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-16, 18-26, 31, 33, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by MacPherson (U.S. Patent 5,858,500).

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over MacPherson (U.S. Patent 5,858,500) in view of Burton (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,380).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-16, 18-26, 31, 33, and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by MacPherson (U.S. Patent 5,858,500).

Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson does not anticipate claims 1, 20, and 31, because MacPherson does not teach each and every feature of claims 1, 20, and 31. For example, MacPherson does not teach "wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap" (emphasis added). The electrically conductive lines or tracks are printed onto the outer surface of each layer of the wrap and therefore do not exist **within** the layer as required by claims 1, 20, and 31. See MacPherson, col. 4, lines 52-56: "The laminate is formed of a number of separate layers, the outermost delamination respondent layer including a matrix 34 of diagonally extending semi-conductive lines **printed onto** a rectangular, thin insulating film 36" (emphasis added). See also MacPherson, col. 5, lines 10-12: "The layer 46 includes tracks 48 of carbon loaded polyester ink **printed onto opposite sides of** an electrically insulating film 50" (emphasis added).

In "Response To Arguments" the Examiner argues: "In response to the applicant's arguments that "MacPherson does not teach 'wherein a plurality of electrically conductive lines or a plurality of electrically conductive ink traces exist within each layer of the wrap", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive because the claim limitation says "within" not "in". Once the lines are printed on the wrap they are "within" the wrap because they inside the limits of the wrap."

In response to the preceding argument by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully contend that "within" is defined as follows: "in or into the interior, on the inside, internally" (see

Webster's New World Dictionary 1535 (3d ed. 1988)). Another dictionary provides the following definitions of within: "in or into the interior; on the inside or inner side, internally; inside the bounds as of a region; inside the body" (see Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary 984 (2d ed. 1958)). The preceding dictionary definition of "within" supports Applicants' interpretation of claim 1 as applied to MacPherson and does not support the Examiner's interpretation of claim 1 as applied to MacPherson.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that MacPherson does not anticipate claims 1, 20, and 31, and that claims 1, 20, and 31 are in condition for allowance. Since claims 2, 4-10, and 12-13 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2, 4-10, and 12-13 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 34-36 depend from claim 20, Applicants contend that claims 34-36 are likewise in condition for allowance. Since claims 32-33 depends from claim 31, Applicants contend that claims 32-33 are likewise in condition for allowance.

In addition with respect to claim 2, Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson does not teach the feature: "wherein the electronic assembly comprises a cryptographic processor card adapted to store key codes to encrypt and decrypt information enclosed within the electronic assembly". The Examiner argues that MacPherson, col. 4, lines 24-28 teaches the preceding feature of claim 2. In response, Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson, col. 4, lines 24-28 teaches only an encryption module and therefore teaches encryption but does not teach decryption as required by claim 2. Accordingly, MacPherson does not anticipate claim 2.

In addition with respect to claims 5-6, 18, and 26, Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson does not teach "a system of resistor within each layer of the wrap". The Examiner

argues that MacPherson, col. 4 line 51 - col. 5, line 29 uses the ink traces as the system of resistors. In response, Applicants respectfully contend that the language of claims 5-6, 18, and 26 require the system of resistors to be in addition to the ink traces. Therefore claims 5-6, 18, and 26 do not read on MacPherson if the system of resistors are used as the ink traces in MacPherson, col. 4 line 51 - col. 5, line 29 as argued by the Examiner. Accordingly, MacPherson does not anticipate claims 5-6, 18, and 26.

Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson does not anticipate claim 14, because MacPherson does not teach each and every feature of claim 14.

For example, MacPherson does not teach "an extension, having a first end inserted in the assembly, and a second end having **at least one bonding pad thereon**" (emphasis added). The Examiner argues that MacPherson teaches the preceding feature of claim 14 in col. 4, lines 43-46. In response, Applicants respectfully contend that col. 4, lines 43-46 discloses only a ribbon cable and does not teach that an end of the ribbon cable has a bonding pad thereon as required by claim 14. In fact, MacPherson does not disclose the existence of a bonding pad anywhere in U.S.P. 5,858,500.

As another example, MacPherson does not teach "a tamper respondent wrap at least partially surrounding the assembly, having at least one corresponding **bonding pad**, wherein the **bonding pad** of the extension is secured to the bonding pad of the wrap" (emphasis added). The Examiner argues: "see column 4, line 51 through column 5, line 29, where "at least on corresponding bonding pad" is read on "connectors"". In response, Applicants contend that while a bonding pad is a connector, a connector is not necessarily a bonding pad. Indeed, a bonding pad

is a particular type of connector which is not disclosed by MacPherson. Applicants respectfully contend that col. 4, lines 51 - col. 5, line 29 most certainly does not teach that the wrap comprises a bonding pad as required by claim 14. In fact, MacPherson does not teach the existence of a bonding pad anywhere in U.S.P. 5,858,500.

In "Response To Arguments" the Examiner argues that "it is not clear how the phrase "bonding pad" differs from the "connectors" disclosed by MacPherson. They both are used to describe an area of the extension used to hold connections between the assembly and the wrap."

In response to the preceding argument by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully contend that there is insufficient description of the connectors 40 of MacPherson to conclude that the connectors 40 are bonding pads. However, even if the connectors are bonding pads (which they are not), MacPherson does not disclose the existence of a connector at an end of an extension cable as required by claim 14. Applicants point out the claim 14 requires corresponding bonding pads "wherein the bonding pad of the extension is secured to the bonding pad of the wrap", which MacPherson most certainly does not disclose.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that MacPherson does not anticipate claim 14, and that claim 14 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 15-19 depend from claim 14, Applicants contend that claims 15-19 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully contend that MacPherson does not anticipate claim 21, because MacPherson does not teach each and every feature of claim 21. For example, MacPherson does not teach "wherein an end of the flexible extension cable has a bonding pad thereon."

MacPherson does not disclose the existence of a bonding pad an end of an extension cable as explained *supra* in relation to claim 14.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that MacPherson does not anticipate claim 21, and that claim 21 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 22-26 depend from claim 21, Applicants contend that claims 22-26 are likewise in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over MacPherson (U.S. Patent 5,858,500) in view of Burton (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,380).

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 are not unpatentable over MacPherson in view of Burton, because MacPherson in view of Burton does not teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 3, 17, 32, and 34. For example, MacPherson in view of Burton does not teach or suggest "wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly".

The Examiner argues: "Burton teaches a planar intelligent battery lable for the exterior surface of a standard battery pack (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly (see column 10, lines 1-14).... Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson to include wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly.... It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified MacPherson by the teachings of Burton because wherein the tamper respondent wrap includes an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly would retain the folded overlapping portions in place and would conceal the lines (see MacPherson, column 5, lines 33-40)."

In response to the preceding argument by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully contend that the Examiner's argument for modifying MacPherson with the teaching of Burton is not

09/717,698

14

persuasive for at least the following two reasons.

The first reason why the Examiner's argument for modifying MacPherson with the teaching of Burton is not persuasive is that MacPherson already has a mechanism for retaining the folded overlapping portions in place. See MacPherson, lines 33-34: "Adhesive is provided to retain the folded and overlapping portions in place." Therefore, MacPherson does not need "an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly" to retain the folded and overlapping portions in place.

The second reason why the Examiner's argument for modifying MacPherson with the teaching of Burton is not persuasive is that MacPherson already has a mechanism for concealing the lines. See MacPherson, lines 37-39: "A thin layer of adhesive, blackened with a light loading of carbon, is applied to the enclosure 26 and conceals the lines." " Therefore, MacPherson does not need "an adhesive inner surface that adheres the wrap to the electronic assembly" to conceal the lines.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 are not unpatentable over MacPherson in view of Burton, and that claims 3, 17, 32, and 34 are in condition for allowance.



CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 03/01/2005

Jack P. Friedman  
Jack P. Friedman  
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts  
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201  
Latham, New York 12110  
(518) 220-1850

09/717,698

16